



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the theory that this self-consciousness "can only be explained by means of eschatology" (p. 364). All attempts at an organic construction of the life of Jesus from the standpoint of a spiritual interpretation of his messianic self-consciousness are denounced as "psychologizing" (e. g., pp. 219, 244, 247). As a matter of fact, the materials for this interpretation confront us in the gospels. Eschatological elements, of course, exist. They were the scaffolding, so to speak, of the messianic hope which Jesus discovered to be realized in himself. But in virtue of his unique relationship to God, that filial relationship realized in the most intimate spiritual communion, Jesus must inevitably transform the religious conceptions of his time.

We have no space to devote to the central question of the sinlessness of Jesus as estimated by the writers with whom we have dealt. Characteristic of the most recent of them is their apparent reluctance to make negative pronouncements on the subject. Dr. Forrest, whose book on *The Authority of Christ* offers an exceedingly able treatment of an all-important theme, puts the case convincingly when he says:

Any man of ordinary intelligence and of honest moral perceptions has, if he will, the power of recognizing that such a one as Jesus could not refrain from confessing sin, if he felt he had any to confess; that such confession, if it occurred at all, affecting as it must his whole tone and attitude toward God and man, must have been known to the disciples; that if they knew of it, it was morally impossible for them to speak of him afterwards as the sinless one and the Lord of glory; and that therefore no rational account can be given of the gospels as we have them, unless on the hypothesis that the personality they depict was actually free from sin. (P. 28.)

A perusal of recent studies of the life of Jesus is an instructive discipline in the estimating of critical theories. Few of them, indeed, can be accused of the baseless extravagances which appear on the pages of Professor Schmidt. And yet to many the criticism of Kalthoff is strictly relevant: "Jesus," he says, "has become for Protestant theology the vessel into which each theologian pours the contents of his own thought" (Schweitzer, p. 313).

H. A. A. KENNEDY

KNOX COLLEGE  
Toronto, Canada

#### ABBOTT'S JOHANNINE GRAMMAR

This bulky volume<sup>1</sup> is the sixth part of Dr. Abbott's *Diatessarica*, a work which up to the present demands an outlay of some twenty dollars,

<sup>1</sup> *Johannine Grammar*. By Edwin A. Abbott. London: Black; New York: Macmillan, 1906. xxvii + 687 pages. 16s. 6d. net.

and in mere printing and binding gives full value for the money. The output of this veteran scholar is sufficiently remarkable, whatever judgment may be passed by posterity upon his results. From the dedication we learn that "the Johannine materials . . . were gathered and arranged, and the results corrected and revised," by the writer's daughter, whose powers as exhibited here prompt the hope that so excellent a scholar will give us work on her own account when she has completed her part in the "future treatise" hinted at in the present volume. A seventh instalment of these laborious researches will form a most fitting celebration of Dr. Abbott's threescore years and ten, now not far away.

Those who know Dr. Abbott's work will at least expect with confidence a rigid and careful scholarship, which they will get in full measure. They will perhaps be surprised to find so complete an absence of his well-known critical theories. There is hardly a line in this prodigious book to suggest that the author is not on all fours with Westcott as to the personality of the fourth evangelist and the strict historicity of the narrative, miracles and all. The book is wholly given up to grammatical exposition, to such an extent that with the use of the text-index the reader is provided with a commentary on the greater part of the gospel. The arrangement of the material is fairly convenient, when the fulness of the indices is brought in; though the rediscussion of a large number of points by way of supplement in the latter part of the book creates some confusion. The reviewer, however, must here confess himself a fellow-sinner on a smaller scale: the attempt to write grammar in the form of continuous exposition and discussion almost inevitably carries with it the sacrifice of the systematic orderliness which is a primary virtue in a reference grammar. Having thus alluded to my own *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, I may as well express the regrets which its coincidence in publication with Dr. Abbott's book have occasioned me. The early and hurried call for a second edition made it impossible for me to complete my study of *Johannine Grammar*, and the references I have made to it in the new pages do not represent half of what I should wish to make now. In particular I may note a correction Dr. Abbott supplies (p. 519) of my treatment of a Berlin papyrus in the *Classical Review*, repeated in my *Grammar*, p. 75. The words *δραχμαὶς . . . ἃς καὶ ἀποδώσω σοι τῷ ἐγγισμῷ δοθησομένῳ ὀψωνίῳ* I translated "with your next wages." Dr. Abbott, however, points out that the document is an I. O. U., given by a common soldier to a comrade, and suggests instead "at next pay (day)." The suggested sense is, I think, fairly certain. The case remains instrumental, "with my next pay," meaning "at the time of;" and the phrase will still serve to illustrate *ταῖς προσευχαῖς* in Rev. 8:4,

if we slightly change the nuance of the latter. Dr. Abbott's correction of my use of the Leyden magic papyrus (numbered *w* in Leeman's edition) I have briefly discussed already (*Gram.*, 2d. ed. p. 245). His evidence that this document is quoting John 1:15 is clear, and the papyrus must disappear from my evidence that in this case the superlative ousted the comparative. But that in the vernacular of moderately cultivated people *πρῶτος* did supplant *πρότερος* seems to me the more certain for Dr. Abbott's own quotations. It is quite possible that the Teubner editor of Plutarch was justified in accepting the conjecture *πρότερος* where the MS have *πρῶτος*, for Plutarch was writing literary Greek; but the MS tradition in his case and Aelian's, with the passages Dr. Abbott quotes from scholiasts, may be taken as sufficient evidence that in ordinary speech even educated people did not care for the nearly obsolete word *πρότερος*. (How many of us take the trouble to say "on the former occasion" instead of "the first time"?) Dr. Abbott's translation "my chief" claims in its support the unquestioned use of *πρῶτος* as a title; I may present him with a new and early (but not very good) example from the just published Hibeh Papyri, No. 110 (see the editor's note, p. 293). In 15:18 he apparently wishes the phrase to suggest "Elder Brother" as well. That the Latin *priorem vobis* means "something like this" I should hardly think proved; and the alleged Johannine use seems to me rather a long way from the technical term *πρῶτος* as used in the papyri and in Acts 28:7. Moreover, the parallels for the genitive are not exact. I may say "premier of Great Britain," but not "my premier;" and the possibility of "my chief" does not avail till it is shown that *πρῶτος* is capable of this kind of genitive.

In a book of this size there are naturally a great many decisions which the reviewer would like to confirm or challenge at length; but space forbids. There are two main characteristics of Dr. Abbott's grammatical exegesis which may be singled out for remark. The first is the pervading subtlety of his interpretation. Westcott was subtle enough, but the "spiritual interpretations" which in this book either underlie the history or are to be substituted for it go beyond anything we have seen in modern times; we seem to be studying the allegorical expositions of Origen's school. Two specimens may be quoted, the first as perhaps the solitary example in this book of Dr. Abbott's characteristic short way with miracles. It refers to the walking on the sea:

Under "Prepositions" . . . reasons will be given for thinking that John regards the Lord as "*on the seashore*," and not as advancing over the sea to the boat. If so, he may use *γινόμενον ἐγγύς* as we speak of the coast "*coming into view*" when we ourselves "*come*" within sight of it. The words and their

context are susceptible of a spiritual interpretation. At first the disciples, in terror and unbelief, beheld Jesus "*becoming near*." Then (6:21) "they willed to receive him;" and "straightway the boat was on the land." That is to say, like the Ephesians, "they that had been far off were made to be near." (P. 19.)

I confess the miracle, understood in the old-fashioned way, seems to me quite an everyday occurrence after reading this. Is it dulness of spiritual perception which forces us to ask *what really happened*, in John's conception of the event, between vss. 20 and 21? Our other example is from the exposition of John's concluding narrative (p. 544). Dr. Abbott regards *προσφάγιον* as "later, and more vernacular than [its equivalent] *δψάριον*." (Here I agree; see my note, *Gram.*, p. 170.) "In classical Greek," he proceeds, "it might naturally be taken as a form of *πρόσφαγμα* 'a preliminary victim.'" Then, quoting Origen, he says that Christ, "standing on the shore" of Tiberias at the moment of sunrise, might be a type of the sacrifice that is "sent up at the moment of the enlightening of the soul." Regarded in this light, *προσφάγιον* might have an inner meaning intelligible to none but the initiated—including an allusion to the ΙΧΘΥC, or ONE FISH, which in this very narrative appears as a eucharistic type of Christ: "Ye have not yet received THE FISH. Ye have not yet partaken of that sacrificial victim which was slain before the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8), without which the eyes of your souls cannot be enlightened nor can ye see how to cast the net of the Church 'on the right side' of the ship." Comment seems hardly necessary; but I must venture to assert that if the Fourth Gospel was really intended to suggest to "the initiated" "spiritual interpretations" so desperately far-fetched as these, we have exceedingly little use for such a book at the present day. "Now we see in a mirror, riddle-wise" gets a new and sinister meaning when symbolism goes wild in this fashion. Augustine's interpretation of the "25 or 30 furlongs" need make us gasp no more.

I need not say that, however incapable I am of understanding or accepting interpretation on these lines, I am perfectly aware that Dr. Abbott not only has every right to his own view, as a scholar of great learning and experience and remarkable originality, but errs, if he does err, in the very best company. In the other line of criticism on which I might venture, I am questioning not only Dr. Abbott's results, but those to which most of us were brought up. There are a great many grammatical points upon which I no longer feel it possible to insist, on the survival of classical distinctions in the vernacular Common Greek of the first century; for my reasons I must refer to my *Grammar*. Dr. Abbott quotes frequently from the non-literary papyri, but I hardly think he has adequately realized the

change in our perspective which the systematic study of the vernacular documents has brought us since Deissmann showed us the way.

To mention two important examples, Dr. Abbott refuses to be convinced by the evidence which has forced most of us to disbelieve in the sharp distinction of *εἰς* and *ἐν*, and in the presumption that *ἵνα* must have some degree of purposive force in it, express or latent; and he refines as boldly as if he were dealing with classical texts. Here he is going back, not upon the revolutionary theories of a modern authority like Blass, but even upon views admitted with due caution by the English editor of Winer a generation ago. In 1:18 we find Dr. Abbott translating "He that IS *into* the bosom of the Father;" "from man the Logos is ever going up *to* God and is also abiding *in* Him." Now, when we know that this "provincialism" (as Blass calls the confusion of *εἰς* and *ἐν*) was current at the time when the gospel was written, can we acquiesce in the supposition that John used language so eminently ambiguous to express a most recondite meaning? Dr. Abbott tries to meet Blass's argument as to *εἶναι εἰς* with words denoting places, of which he declares no safe example is forthcoming. Whatever may be the facts as to *εἶναι*, I cannot feel satisfied with the devices by which any verb of rest with *εἰς* is declared to have some latent motion about it. The papyrus BU 385 *εἰς Ἀλεξανδρείαν ἐσσί* (*sic*) may not count much, though I do not believe the obsolete *εἶμι* really does occur either there or in O P 529. But we may quote an unmistakable example in Acts 11:25 *Δὲ εἰς Τάρσον ἐστὶ*, which must be at least a second-century reading; nor can I see the difference when in a Ptolemaic inscription (Letronne, 26) we find *οἱ παρεπιδημοῦντες εἰς φίλας*. No doubt the use of *εἰς* for *ἐν* started in phrases where the motion idea was latent; but the weakening of the distinction between "whither?" and "where?" which admittedly ended in the vanishing of *ἐν*, is by far the most obvious *vera causa* for passages in which the motion can only be forced by violence upon the Greek. And can we really say that the recondite meanings which Westcott or Abbott get out of the *εἰς* are appropriate to the relation between the Logos and God? Surely here if anywhere we desiderate a preposition which denotes unchanging rest. We had better return to the view which Buttmann preferred long ago (see Winer-Moulton, p. 518, n.), that we must admit "a more negligent use of *εἰς*, recognizing in these examples the first steps toward the ultimate confusion of the two prepositions."

Space forbids my discussing at equal length the Johannine use of *ἵνα*. Here I must frankly confess that I would not merely acknowledge the existence of *ἵνα ἐκβατικόν*, as Winer's English editor was ready to do.

Epictetus himself—the use of whose Greek to illustrate John is one of the most useful features of Dr. Abbott's book—can even substitute *ἵνα* for consecutive *ὥστε*. Examples from Hellenistic literature and the New Testament show that *ἵνα* can take the place of any kind of infinitive; I need not repeat the account I have given elsewhere (*Gram.*, pp. 40 f., 205, 211) of the geographical distribution of infinitive and *ἵνα*-locution, according to the theory of Professor Thumb. I have admitted that “the strong volitive flavor which clung to *ἵνα* would perhaps commend it as a mannerism to a writer of John's temperament.” But to seek all manner of mysteries in a construction which other first-century writers adopted for the whole gamut of infinitive uses, seems to me straining probabilities. *Quem nosse vivere*—except for the important difference between *γινώσκειν* (pres.) and *nosse*—translates 17:3 as exactly as we could wish, if I am not grievously wrong. We put purposive force into *ἵνα* just when we put it into our own infinitive—that is, when the context decisively requires it—not elsewhere.

A few miscellaneous points may be noticed. On p. 76 Dr. Abbott says he has “not found in classical [Greek an instance of *ἀγαπᾶν τινα* with *ἀγάπην*.” Has he found *ἀγάπη* with anything else? The discovery, after Deissmann's disappointment (*Bible Studies*, pp. 198 f.), would have peculiar interest. I should like to have discussed some of the alleged “Hebraic” uses—such as that of *καί*, p. 133—but I must be content with registering a general dissent. On instrumental *ἐν* (p. 256) I may refer to my *Grammar*, where I hope I have sufficiently reinforced Deissmann's arguments against the Semitism. On p. 319 Dr. Abbott delivers *en passant* a judgment with which few philologists will agree, when he suggests the existence of a difference in function between first and second aorist. It would be very interesting if we could have the evidence that “the second aorist has not this solemn or authoritative meaning” which has just been assigned to the imperative first aorist. There is much I should like to have discussed in Dr. Abbott's treatment of the tenses, but I must be content with what I have said independently in print already. I will only note that on p. 344 it is misleading to say that *τεθέαμαι* might mean “I have [just] beheld;” it is the aorist which expresses the *immediate* past. The same remark applies to the comment on *τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ* (p. 366). I am necessarily passing over in these notes the many points of grammar and exegesis in which Dr. Abbott seems to me to have given us sound and excellent doctrine; but I must make an exception in favor of the argument by which he claims the series (1) *μον τὰ ῥήματα*, (2) *τὰ ῥήματά μου*, (3) *τὰ ἐμὰ ῥήματα*, (4) *τὰ ῥήματα τὰ ἐμά* as a “climax of pronominal emphasis.” The statement that

(1) is the weakest position for the possessive seems fairly established, and if so is of very wide importance in exegesis. Resuming the points of difference, I cannot feel satisfied with the distinction drawn between *παρέλαβον* and *ἔλαβον* in 1:11, 12 (p. 426); a much simpler explanation comes from classical idiom, as shown in my *Grammar*, p. 115. Dr. Abbott's comment (p. 480) on the "curious spelling of *ποιεῖν* as *πνεῖν*" in some illiterate papyri would suggest that this *ν* for *αι* was something of a rarity. It is abundant in documents of this class, and actually gives rise to the late name *ῥ ψιλόν*—i e., the the *ü* sound written with one letter instead of the diphthong *αι*, which at this period had the same value. This fact has caused him to accept a mistaken correction of the editors in O P 269: *ἐὰν σοι δῷ* is not for *δῶ*, but for *δοῖ*, a subjunctive form familiar enough in the New Testament and in papyri. The infinitive *δῶναι* which he cites on the same page (530) is also not uncommon. On p. 501 Dr. Abbott criticizes a statement of "Winer-Moulton" as to *ἀκούσομαι*, but he overlooks Moulton's correction in the footnote. The difficulty noted on p. 539 as to omissions of *αν* is not, I think, justified by the vernacular documents and the LXX; see my *Gram.*, p. 200 (where I have to confess to an unfortunate slip in copying one of the two papyrus passages Dr. Abbott himself quotes. The mistake, and a premature inference from it, are corrected in corrigenda to the second edition). I might add, for New Testament examples of dropped *αν*, Gal. 4:20 and Acts 15:22; also Gal. 3:21 D\*FG, which, whether right or wrong, helps to prove the obsolescence of *αν* in the vernacular. On p. 600 Dr. Abbott quotes papyrus passages for *ἐὰν ᾗν* (*ἐνῆν*), regarding these as imperfects. I think I have proved that these are (generally, at least) subjunctives, with a parasitic *ν* that is not infrequently found after long vowels at the end of words (*Gram.*, pp. 49, 168). Dr. Rouse notes for me how common the phenomenon is in modern Greek. Dr. Abbott's suggestions (p. 609) as to Paul's inability to write Greek characters except in clumsy, uncouth fashion, would take too long to discuss here, but they seem to run counter to all we have been learning as to Paul's perfect command of spoken Greek.

The selection of points of difference—and naturally there are a good many more which could not be referred to—has taken up too much space for me to emphasize as I should have wished the invaluable character of the material with which this monumental volume is packed from beginning to end. I frankly disbelieve in nearly all of Dr. Abbott's secondary meanings, and most heartily trust that he will not prolong the life of an exegesis which is only that of the Fathers risen again. And in many grammatical principles I think he has not specialized in Hellenistic enough to shake himself free



from the predispositions of the classical scholar. But no one will study the Fourth Gospel, or New Testament Grammar in general, without seeking and finding in Dr. Abbott's work the most careful, acute, and suggestive investigations of its problems.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON

DIDSBURY COLLEGE  
Manchester, England

### SHELDON'S SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

This latest work<sup>1</sup> of Professor Sheldon is the ripe result of his years of faithful and patient study of the Christian system. Out of the fulness of large acquaintance with what history has delivered to us, and the new thought of the modern epoch added, he has set forth what he believes to be the truth with great clearness, in a conciliatory temper, and with impartial fairness. And the system which he has produced is, in substance, the historical theology of the church.

The work is divided into five "parts," dealing successively with "Pre-suppositions," "The Doctrine of God," "The Subjects of God's Moral Government," "The Person and Work of the Redeemer," and "The Kingdom of Redemption." The whole is followed by some essays upon Christ's resurrection, ethnic trinities, scholastic realism, the theory of a merely ideal pre-existence of Christ, and some ethico-religious questions—marriage, Sunday, temperance. It is in the first part, and in a lesser degree in these essays, that the more important contributions to the settlement of questions at present vexing the religious mind are to be found.

Beginning with self-consciousness as the source of our knowledge, Sheldon affirms the necessity of a unitary psychical agent, or self, as a condition of knowledge. He does not bring the discussion of this subject farther down than Mill and Spencer, though it is equally demanded by the current methods of what is now specifically called "psychology," which is often vague in affirming, when not positively denying, a real agent. He then passes to the validity of knowledge, in which he refutes the extreme idealism of Kant, and maintains objective knowledge and an objective world. The chapter is brought to an end by a discussion of the principles of a rational interpretation of the universe.

The "existence of the Infinite Person" is next introduced. Sheldon does not intend to attempt to prove the existence of the Christian God without reference to the Christian Scriptures from which, historically, our very idea of God has come; but he thinks it right here to discuss "the

<sup>1</sup> *System of Christian Doctrine*. By Henry C. Sheldon. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye, 1903. xii+636 pages. \$2.50.